

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Substitute drawing sheets 2/8 through 6/8 are attached to this amendment. The substitute drawing sheets include no new matter.

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to three aspects of the drawings. First, with regard to the reference numeral 1, it is intended to relate to the entire signal delaying device shown in FIGURES 2-6. Numeral 1 and the lead line have been repositioned so that it points to the entire device in the attached substitute drawings.

The Examiner has also objected to reference numeral 3. Reference numeral 3 designates the interpolation element, which comprises half-band filter 4 and polyphase filter 5. Applicants have included a bracket in the drawings to make it clear that element 3 includes elements 4 and 5 in the attached substitute drawings.

The Examiner has also objected that the register 3 is connected to an input site of the interpolation element in FIGURES 2-6. This is correct as shown in the drawings. See the discussion below. Thus, no correction is required.

Substitute drawing sheets 2/8 through 6/8 are attached to this amendment. The drawing corrections should satisfy the Examiner's objections.

The rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. The Examiner states that the applicants have not particularly pointed how the "dynamic delaying" of a digitally sampled input signal is performed. The claims have been amended to make it clear that the dynamic delaying is accomplished by the interpolation element which stores at least one sampled value of the input signal.

The Examiner has also stated that it is not clear whether the register 30 is connected to the input or output side of the interpolation element. Claim 1 and the specification have been amended to conform to the drawings. Clear support may be found in the drawings. The incorrect language was the result of a translation error.

The Examiner has also objected to the use of the word "can" in Claim 1. That term has been deleted.


The Examiner has also rejected Claim 6 in that the terms range (19), range (20), and range 21 are not defined in the claim. It is submitted, however, that each range is defined in the claim as that range lying between two successive sampled values from the memory element. It is submitted that this definition is adequate to advise one of ordinary skill how to interpret the claim. Thus, it is believed that Claim 6 as written is definite.

The rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidd et al. in view of Hermann is respectfully traversed. It is noted that Claims 2-12 have been indicated to be allowable. Applicants have incorporated the limitations of Claim 2 into Claim 1 and amended Claim 3 so that it now depends from Claim 1. In addition, applicants have incorporated the limitations of Claim 1 into Claim 4 rendering it an independent claim. Claim 5 depends from Claim 4. Thus, amended Claims 1 and 4 contain all of the limitations of Claims 2 and 4, respectively, which have been indicated to be allowable. These amendments should obviate the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reexamine the application, to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the drawings, and the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 103, and to promptly allow the case and pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any further questions, he is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Lee E. Johnson
Registration No. 22,946
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1701

LEJ:mk/ejh